UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3247
29 June 1993

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND
TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 29 June 1993, at 3 p.m.

President:	Mr. YAÑEZ BARNUEVO	(Spain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. de ARAUJO CASTRO
	Cape Verde	Mr. JESUS
	China	Mr. LI Zhaoxing
	Djibouti	Mr. OLHAYE
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	Hungary	Mr. ERDÖS
	Japan	Mr. MARUYAMA
	Morocco	Mr. SNOUSSI
	New Zealand	Mr. KEATING
	Pakistan	Mr. MARKER
	Russian Federation	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mrs. ALBRIGHT
	Venezuela	Mr. ARRIA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

93-86203 4724-25V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, Estonia, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Latvia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Senegal, Slovenia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey and United Arab Emirates in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Farhadi (Afghanistan), Mr. Shkurti (Albania), Mr. Hadid (Algeria), Mr. Kabir (Bangladesh), Mr. Moumin (Comoros), Mr. Tattenbach (Costa Rica), Mr. Nobilo (Croatia), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Ainso (Estonia), Mr. Wisnumurti (Indonesia), Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abu Odeh (Jordan), Mr. Blukis (Latvia), Mr. Omar (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Razali (Malaysia), Mr. Sy (Senegal), Mr. Kovacic (Slovenia), Mr. Issa (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Jerandi (Tunisia), Mr. Burcuoglu (Turkey) and Mr. Samhan (United Arab Emirates) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I have also received a request dated 25 June 1993 from Ambassador Dragomir Djokic to address the Council. With the consent of the Council, I propose to invite him to address the Council in the course of the discussion of the item before it.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/25997, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Cape Verde, Djibouti, Morocco, Pakistan and Venezuela. In addition, Afghanistan, Algeria, the Comoros, Egypt, Estonia, Latvia, Malaysia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey have joined as sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document S/25997.

The first speaker on my list is the representative of Cape Verde, on whom I now call.

Mr. JESUS (Cape Verde): The people and the Government of my country have followed the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina with a deep feeling of frustration.

Through this ordeal, we have witnessed all kinds of crimes being committed against the people of Bosnia in persistent, deliberate and defiant disregard for international humanitarian law. Mass rape and forced pregnancy, ethnic cleansing, indiscriminate killing, torture, deliberate shelling of civilian targets and starvation have been pursued constantly and primarily as a Serb policy designed to conquer and occupy territory in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

There has been universal condemnation of such crimes. Time and again, Governments, humanitarian institutions, non-governmental organizations and the citizens of this world have expressed their anguish over this tragic and unacceptable situation and have cried out for measures to stop the carnage, reverse the aggression and defend the victims of this armed conflict.

The Security Council itself has met countless times to consider this situation and has adopted more than 40 resolutions to deal with the conflict. Notwithstanding the measures decided by the Council - some of them adopted even under Chapter VII - the United Nations has been unable, to our regret, to take action to contain the war, effectively defend the civilian population and stop the abhorrent practice of ethnic cleansing.

The lack of political will on the part of those that have the power and the means and bear the special responsibility to carry out, and ensure the implementation of, the decisions of this Council is a cause of major concern to my country. Indeed, it sends a very disturbing message to those of us that believe that our security and the security of the world at large can, in the end, be maintained only through a reliable United Nations collective security system.

(Mr. Jesus, Cape Verde)

The failure of the Council and the Organization to implement effectively the Charter collective security provisions with a view to honouring the Council's decisions on the Bosnian conflict is bound to have a major negative impact on the outcome of the current and potential conflicts. It might be interpreted by those that would like to take in their hands the solution of their disputes with others as incapacity by the United Nations to stand up to its responsibilities to maintain peace and reverse aggression. The situation might escalate, and at best the progress in arms negotiations might be delayed, for one of the most negative lessons that might be drawn from this conflict is that countries and peoples might have to rely in the future on their own capacity to defend themselves. It also might give rise to a credibility problem for this Council that could be detrimental to its handling of other conflicts.

For the small nations, which are the majority of the Members of this Organization and which can meet their security needs only by relying on respect for the principles and norms of international law and on the effective implementation of the decisions of this Council, especially its Chapter VII decisions, the Bosnian experience is indeed a very disturbing development.

The caucus of the non-aligned members of the Security Council - namely, Djibouti, Morocco, Pakistan, Venezuela and my own country, Cape Verde - believes that the policy goals for dealing with the Bosnian conflict would be best met through the action of the United Nations and the effective implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions. Unfortunately, this has not been possible, to our regret.

Therefore, if the United Nations is unable to take action to halt the armed conflict and to defend the Muslim civilian population of Bosnia from the continuous attacks they have been subjected to - as abundantly documented

(Mr. Jesus, Cape Verde)

through the press - the minimum that can be done by the Council is to allow them to defend themselves.

For a long time now, calls for United Nations action to assist in the defence of the Bosnian civilian population from attacks and to save it from further atrocities have repeatedly gone unheeded. Meanwhile, the safe areas declared under Chapter VII continue to be consistently challenged by the Serbs and their protection jeopardized, while we are still witnessing the occupation of land by force and the practice of ethnic cleansing.

In submitting the draft resolution before the Council, the caucus of the non-aligned members of the Security Council is responding to a moral call aimed at enabling those that have been throughout this tragic conflict victims of aggression and ethnic cleansing to exercise their inherent right of self-defence as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations. If we, the United Nations, cannot or do not have the political will to take prompt and effective action to stop the killing of civilians being perpetrated daily against the Bosnian Muslims, we should at least allow them to legitimately defend themselves against such attacks.

Indeed, this caucus draft resolution, in proposing the lifting of the arms embargo in favour of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, makes it clear that such a measure is being proposed for the sole purpose of enabling that Republic to defend itself from attacks and not as a means to escalate the violence of the conflict.

It is morally wrong and politically disastrous for us to tell the Bosnians that we cannot defend them from aggression and the repeated attacks against them and at the same time deny them the means and the right to defend themselves.

It has been said that the lifting of the arms embargo in favour of Bosnia

(Mr. Jesus, Cape Verde)

is a policy of despair. This might probably be the case. But what kind of other measures are there to take to defend the lives of the civilian population and the existence of an entire community that for months has been constantly under fierce attack and subjected to atrocities, if the United Nations will not come to their rescue?

Unfortunately, after many failed attempts to have the United Nations play the role that is its own in the field of the maintenance of peace and security, we were left, it seemed, with only two options: either to let the Muslim community continue to die and disappear as a community, at the hands of their well-equipped enemies, for whom the arms embargo has been throughout the conflict a dead letter; or to allow them to exercise the basic and inherent right to defend themselves, until a negotiated solution is found.

The caucus, by proposing this draft resolution, has clearly chosen the latter option, for we believe that acting otherwise would be a great and painful mistake. Although the lifting of the arms embargo, even when it is confined to purposes of defence, might be seen by some as a policy of despair, it is perhaps the only realistic measure that, in the circumstances, might help to dispel the despair.

The PRESIDENT (intepretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on whom I now call.

Mr. SACIRBEY (Bosnia and Herzegovina): A day before the end of your term, Mr. President, let me once again congratulate you on the way you have managed the affairs of the Security Council.

And let me here thank the membership of the non-aligned caucus, and in particular the Chairman for this month, Ambassador Jesus, on the work that has been done to bring the cause of Bosnia before the Security Council - something that is so urgently needed.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Two questions, and two questions only, are relevant in evaluating the merit of this draft resolution. First, has the Security Council compelled the necessary means to stop the aggression and genocide directed at the Republic and citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina? Secondly, if not, what are the new and necessary measures that should be undertaken to stop this never-ending aggression and mayhem, particularly should the arms embargo on the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina be declared de jure invalid in accordance with the United Nations Charter's guarantee of the right of self-defence? I would also note that one of the few resolutions effectively implemented with respect to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been Security Council resolution 713 (1991).

Some may attempt to confuse the matter by redefining the issues in order to excuse failure, justify inaction and mask a lack of real commitment to dealing decisively with the problem. Integrity necessitates that we appraise the Council's measures primarily on the basis of results and not grandiose statements made within this Chamber. Fifteen months after the Serbian aggression was initiated; 11 months after we all first saw television pictures of Bosnian victims in Serb concentration camps; 10 months after the heralded London Conference and its many promises; eight months after Lord Owen and Mr. Vance issued their first set of constitutional principles for Bosnia and Herzegovina; three months after we signed the Vance-Owen plan; and after the visits of countless well-meaning or self-serving high-profile individuals, mediators and delegations to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the agony continues and there is no light at the end of the tunnel.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Only more conferences and meetings are proposed. New mediators are appointed while others are retired. Ever more diluted sets of principles, supposedly insuring Bosnia's sovereignty, territorial integrity and justice are once again restated. More negotiations, without the means or the will to implement them, are endlessly pursued. More delegations come to Bosnia. More Bosnians are "ethnically cleansed" from Bosnia. More Bosnians die in Bosnia.

Indefinite negotiations, conferences and so-called initiatives do not necessarily advance the cause of peace. But it is clear that some would use the perception of motion to create the illusion of progress. We, the Bosnians, are dead tired of running on this treadmill of cynicism that exhausts us with bitterness, hopelessness and helplessness while serving the public relations interests of certain political leaders. Clearly, the necessary measures have not been taken to bring peace, and the Bosnians subsequently find themselves no further along the road to peace but utterly drained by the journey. So we come to the second question: What are the new and necessary measures that should be undertaken to bring peace?

Bosnia consists of hundreds of cities and towns and of thousands of villages. While we pursue faithfully the policies established under the "safe havens" resolution, who will defend most of our citizens who happen to live in these non-safe areas when its seems that even the designated safe areas are not so safe? Among the Members States here today are some who strongly advocated the establishment of safe areas in six Bosnian cities as delineated in resolution 824 (1993), and later committed themselves in resolution 836 (1993)

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

"to ensure full respect for the safe areas referred to in resolution 824 (1993)" (resolution 836 (1993), para. 4)

and reaffirmed in that resolution:

"the unacceptability of the acquisition of territory by the use of force and the need to restore the full sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina" (resolution 836 (1993), para. 3).

Let me inquire of those who were so zealous for the adoption of these measures the reasons for their deafening silence today. Why was it not enough for you to respond when shells rained upon the safe-area of Gorazde? Was it not a clearly observed violation of Sarajevo's safe area status when the Serbians lobbed several shells into a playground, killing and maiming tens of children? When will you be prepared to respond if the Secretary-General's implementation report on resolution 836 (1993) apparently relies upon the good conduct of those who still ignore the basic norms of civilised behaviour? How can you have an effective deterrent force if up to now you have lacked the will and commitment to confront aggression?

But the most critical question is: For how long do you expect those of us living in disease-plagued Srebrenica and the other five so-called safe areas to suffer the indignity, decay and uncertainty of these new holding pens? How long will you have a commitment to stay? Finally, for how long can those of us living in the non-safe areas survive in our homes unless you allow us the means of self-defence? Even assuming effective implementation and enforcement, the "safe areas" resolution at best can only benefit some of our people temporarily and none of our people permanently.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

The latest supposed option to promote peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina comes directly from the unfortunate President Franjo Tudjman and from Slobodan Milosevic, the man who initiated aggression and who has been identified as a war criminal by several non-governmental organizations and the United States State Department. Inconceivably, immediately after declaring his own plan dead, Mr. David Owen embraced Milosevic's plan. A novel approach in healing as well as diplomacy: Adopt the peace plan of the war-maker, subject the victim to the criminals' goodwill and save a pluralistic nation by partitioning it. If Bosnia and Herzegovina wanted to commit suicide, we would not need the assistance of the Dr. Jack Kevorkian of mediation and diplomacy.

Even more incredibly, after having committed themselves and us to the Vance-Owen peace plan, certain members of the European Community adopted Mr. Owen's view because they were unwilling to confront the Serbians and to pressure them for the adoption and implementation of the Vance-Owen plan. Even though this so-called new peace plan calls for ethnic division, we are now assured that this is not a partition plan. Nonetheless, Mr. Milosevic's vision clearly portends partition and the eventual disintegration of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Recent history, I suggest, has taught us that it is Mr. Milosevic's view that has the greater commitment behind it. Nonetheless, again we are told that, even if the new proposals fall far short of stated goals, we must accept the diminished results.

We are now being urged to accept the new realities. Those who in fact have actively endeavoured to limit our options now tell us that we have no other options. I ask His Excellency the representative of France: Could the

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

French people have been convinced that Vichy France was an acceptable alternative to the majesty of a free and sovereign France? Mr. President, is it historically justified to ethnically partition a pluralistic, multi-religious society that over 500 years ago was already a safe haven of tolerance and multiculturalism when Jewish refugees, escaping the bigotry of Western Europe and Spain, came to Bosnia? I ask His Excellency the representative of the Russian Federation: did the defenders of Stalingrad persevere to allow, 50 years later in Europe, the fascist siege of Sarajevo?

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

To His Excellency the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sir David Hannay, I say that when Sir Winston Churchill was being persuaded that he had no option but to capitulate to Hitler, he offered "Give us the tools and we will finish the job". If that response is worthy of the British people, then I believe that the British people would agree it is also worthy of the Bosnians.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has waited for well over a year for the most empowered members of the Security Council to fulfil their commitment to confront the Serbians in the peacemaking effort. Only after they failed to meet their commitment have we now sought to reassert our right to obtain the means of self-defence.

It is not enough to feed us at a subsistence level while we continue to be indiscriminately murdered. It is unethical to tell a hungry people that they must sacrifice self-defence in order to be fed. But, if a choice is to be made between humanitarian relief and self-defence, we have unequivocally told the Council which option we choose.

To ignore the Bosnian people's choice on this matter goes beyond arrogance and seeks to mask the failure to honour responsibility.

The permanent members of the Security Council claim an elevated status on the basis of their special commitment to the membership of the United Nations to take the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security. By their permanent membership of this body, and veto power, they are in a position to dictate action or inaction.

In the case of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the permanent members have failed in their special responsibility, but some of them continue to insist on dictating life and death for Bosnia in a way that makes a mockery

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

not only of the United Nations Charter, but of commitments made by this body a mere three and a half weeks ago.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina claims no special status within the family of nations, but we do not agree to be reduced to a lower status so that certain permanent members of the Security Council can carry on with the illusion of their elevated responsibility.

Neither do we appreciate being treated with disdain because we dare to challenge certain permanent members on their unique responsibility and status.

We are persuaded that we should be grateful for the selective humanitarian aid that Bosnia receives, but we understand that this aid is a meagre substitute for resolute action.

We also understand that while committed and courageous individuals endeavour to save Bosnian lives on the ground the intended goal is in fact protecting the public image of compromised leaders.

Whether peace is to come to Bosnia and Herzegovina through confrontation or through negotiations with the aggressor, there is only one choice with respect to this draft resolution: the Bosnians must be provided with the leverage to undertake fair and promising negotiations, or, in the alternative, to confront the undiminished aggression. So far Bosnia has not received this assistance from the most prominent members of the Council. Therefore, the Council does not have the authority to demand any further concessions from us, but should only free us of the shackles that diminish our self-defence and our capacity to pursue joint negotiations.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation, together with those of Cape Verde, Djibouti, Morocco and Venezuela, the other Non-Aligned members of the Security Council, took the initiative of calling for this meeting of

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

the Security Council to address the tragedy of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This situation poses a historical challenge to the international community. What happens in Bosnia will significantly influence the entire course of international relations in the post-cold-war era.

From the outset of the conflict in Bosnia it has been clear that this new State Member of the United Nations was the victim of external aggression. An unarmed Government was confronted by the might of the former Yugoslav army. This aggression has been accompanied by grave atrocities - murder, rape and genocide - carried out at the behest of the Serbian authorities, with a pre-planned design to ethnically cleanse territories as a prelude to their acquisition by force. The grand design of a Greater Serbia has been writ large in the cruel military campaigns waged against the defenceless people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has remained at a grave disadvantage to respond to this blatant aggression, not only because of the large and well-equipped Serb army and paramilitary units employed against it, but because it has been prevented by the United Nations itself from acquiring the means for self-defence.

Over the past 18 months it has become clear to the world community that the Serbian forces will not be deterred by the many exhortations and admonitions of the Council so long as it is not prepared to take enforcement measures, including the use of force under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Unfortunately, the Security Council has so far been unable to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter to halt the Serbian aggression, much less to reverse it. Over the past year and a half the Council has acted in a piecemeal fashion without addressing the core issue of Serbian aggression and

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

the accompanying practice of "ethnic cleansing". At each step the Security Council has done too little and too late. Its lack of decisiveness, its failure to enforce its decisions, its hesitation to respond effectively to the Serbian atrocities, have emboldened the aggressor, which has continued to conduct its brutal campaign against the Bosnian people with impunity.

As an active participant in the work of the Security Council on this important matter since the beginning of this year, Pakistan is aware both of the accomplishments and the difficulties that the Council has faced in dealing with the complicated issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are fully aware and conscious of the fact that but for the presence of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other international humanitarian agencies the casualties and death toll would have been far greater and far more horrific than even the present lamentable figure. We salute the brave men and women of UNPROFOR and the UNHCR, who work under conditions of unimaginable and unprecedented hardship and danger, and recognize that their bravery and dedication have saved literally thousands of men, women and children from death by starvation, disease and indiscriminate bombardment.

My delegation is also conscious of the fact that some of the resolutions passed by the Security Council have had a considerable impact on the situation, particularly our resolutions on sanctions and on safe areas. I should like to point out that Pakistan, together with other Non-Aligned members of the Council, was the initiator of the concept of "safe areas", which led to the adoption of resolutions 819 (1993) and 824 (1993) as an immediate response to an emergency situation in order to save lives. However, the experience in Srebrenica, Zepa and Gorazde revealed the fundamental

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

shortcomings of this concept in the absence of the international community's resolve to endorse the Vance-Owen Peace Plan.

Resolution 836 (1993), on which my delegation abstained, did not address certain core issues of the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It did not contain appropriate enforcement actions by the Council in a given time frame and as a part of an overall plan. As presently applied, the safe-area concept has become an instrument in freezing the situation on the ground to the full advantage of the Serbs. The safe areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina are no more than refugee camps. Most important of all, the concept of safe areas is applicable to only about a third of what is left of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The rest of the country remains unprotected, defenceless and subject to constant attacks by the Serbian aggressors.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Today we are faced with a situation where Serbian forces are occupying over 70 per cent of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Moreover, the Council's failure to respond to the Serbian aggression has also emboldened the Croat forces to revive their campaign of territorial expansion in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Croat forces now occupy over 20 per cent of the country, with the Bosnian Government forces left in control of two separated areas and a few isolated enclaves, which taken together constitute less than 10 per cent of their State's territory.

This is a moment of grave trial for the people and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The consequences of the pressures being exerted on them are evident to all of us. At the same time, this is also a moment of decision for the Security Council. Will the Organization's collective capabilities be used to respond to this blatant aggression against a small Member State which is being torn apart limb by limb, or will the international community fail to respond to the genocide against the Bosnian Muslims and accept the extinction of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations?

To accept a fait accompli, to subscribe to the so-called plan for the partition of Bosnia and Herzegovina, would be a mistake of monumental and historic proportions. The Security Council is the primary organ entrusted with upholding international peace. It is the primary organ to ensure respect for the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The Council surely cannot accept and legitimize the consequences of such blatant acts of aggression against a State Member of the United Nations. It cannot endorse the

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

disintegration of a sovereign State. It cannot accept the results of "ethnic cleansing" and the total liquidation of the Bosnian Muslims, who constitute over 46 per cent of the population of this multi-ethnic nation.

The consequences of accepting the so-called reality which has been created in Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Serbian aggressor would be terrible not only for the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina but for the international community as a whole. This would encourage all those who believe that force can be a viable instrument for territorial expansion and political domination. It would erode the credibility of the Security Council as an instrument for peace and justice not only as regards Bosnia and Herzegovina but in all other conflicts and disputes. It would revive the global arms race as all nations which are exposed to aggression and domination seek to arm themselves against such threats. Finally, it would further incense the Muslims of the world, who have witnessed the systematic slaughter of their Bosnian brothers and sisters. Those in the Muslim world who believe that the West has acquiesced in or even contributed to the defeat of the Bosnian Muslims will be strengthened in their conviction. Those who believe that the United Nations will use force only against Muslims but not in their defence will feel fortified in their belief. If aggression is allowed to stand in Bosnia, the forces of moderation will lose. The forces of extremism will be strengthened.

I wish to make it clear that Pakistan and other Islamic countries will not accept the virtual extermination of a Muslim people in the heart of a continent that prides itself on its commitment to human rights and international legality.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) has consistently argued for a comprehensive solution to the problem based on effective action by the international community. The OIC declaration of 24 May 1993 called on the world community and the Security Council to take decisive steps for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It proposed the following specific actions: first, lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina; second, use of force against heavy weapons that are being employed against civilian population centres in Bosnia and Herzegovina; third, interdiction of arms supplies to the Serbs; fourth, revision of the mandate of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina to enable them to take enforcement action; fifth, expansion of those forces by the addition of troops from other countries, including Islamic countries; sixth, early establishment of the war-crimes Tribunal to deal with "ethnic cleansing" and to punish war crimes and crimes against humanity; seventh, the safe return of the Bosnian refugees to their homes under the peace arrangements for Bosnia and Herzegovina; and eighth, a decision by the Security Council and its permanent members not to accept the unjust fait accompli in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference have made it abundantly clear that, in their view, the Joint Action Programme announced on 22 May 1993 did not address the core issues in Bosnia and Herzegovina and that the concept of "safe areas" approved by resolution 836 (1993) was flawed from the outset. Gorazde and other "safe areas" have been subjected to further Serbian aggression in flagrant violation of resolution 836 (1993) and other Council decisions.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

I would like to recall, however, that when the Council was asked to vote on resolution 836 (1993) it was given solemn assurances that: any peace settlement must be based on the principles contained in the Vance-Owen Plan, which remained valid; there can be no acceptance of the acquisition of territory or alteration of borders by force; until the Serbs withdraw from the land they have seized there can be no final settlement; the Joint Action Programme in the Washington Agreement is based on the principles of the London Conference and is designed to maintain a momentum towards a political settlement; and as the situation developed, stronger measures were not ruled out.

But it is now abundantly evident that, as we feared, the uncertain posture of the Council emboldened the Serbs to intensify their aggression. They have been joined by the Croats. Together, they have now presented the world with what they consider is a fait accompli, in the form of a partition plan put forward by Presidents Milosovic and Tudjman. Interestingly, the advocates of this so-called plan are the leaders of Zagreb and Belgrade. This plan negates all the principles contained in thc Vance-Owen Plan, all the principles of the London Conference, all the principles of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, all the principles of the United Nations Charter. The partition plan is a confirmation of the larger design: to carve up and divide the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina between the Serbs and the Croats. After 18 months of a most brutal and inhuman campaign against a defenceless people, we are now told that this is the so-called new reality based on the acceptance of acquisition of territory through the use of force and the practice of "ethnic cleansing".

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The non-aligned members of the Security Council have proposed a draft resolution, contained in document S/25997, with a view to retrieving the situation, even at this, the eleventh hour. The draft resolution reaffirms, in its preambular part, that a solution must be based on: immediate cessation of hostilities; withdrawal from the territories acquired by aggression, the use of force and "ethnic cleansing"; reversal of the consequences of the reprehensible policy of "ethnic cleansing" and recognition of the right of all Bosnian refugees to return to their homes; and restoration of the territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In paragraphs 1 and 2, it reaffirms the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina and demands that all hostilities against the territory of that State be halted forthwith and that the consequences of aggression against it be reversed in accordance with the principles just stated.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The most important provision of the resolution is to exempt the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the arms embargo imposed on former Yugoslavia by Council resolution 713 (1991) in order to enable it to exercise its inherent right of self-defence. This is a measure which was proposed by a majority of the United Nations membership in General Assembly resolution 47/121 of 18 December 1992. It has been consistently advocated by the Islamic countries. It is entirely consistent with the United Nations Charter, whose Article 51 reaffirms the inherent right of every Member State to individual and collective self-defence.

The options available to the Security Council are stark: either the international community, in accordance with the collective security system envisaged in the Charter, takes effective measures to defend Bosnia and Herzegovina or it should remove the shackles which prevent the victim from exercising its inherent right to self-defence. Those responsible for resisting this have, in fact, contributed to the slaughter of defenceless Bosnian men, women and children. A State Member of this Organization is dying in front of our eyes, and a people, the Bosnian Muslims, is being subjected to a virtual holocaust. And that is the actual reality of the tragedy in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me, first of all, to convey to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. My thanks go also to your predecessor, Ambassador Vorontsov, the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, for the efforts he made during his presidency last month.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

The Security Council is today considering, once again, the situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus it is dealing with an extremely grave problem for international relations now and in the future, a problem that will certainly have an impact on the Council's credibility, in particular because the successive, tragic incidents that have taken place on the ground are taking place even though the new international order is supposed to promote international legitimacy and ensure that the whole international community respects the collective security measures provided for in the Charter to defend the weakest countries among it.

The delegation of Egypt has already issued a warning about the dangers of contradictions in positions and about the dangers of failing to adopt firm measures in respect of Serbian aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. Today, the delegation of Egypt once again draws the attention of the members of the Security Council to the seriousness of the events having to do with the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina, specifically, the international community's failure to deal with the aggression and armed attacks whereby the aggressor, who is the strongest party, is consolidating his increasing territorial gains at the expense of the victim.

The Security Council has adopted dozens of resolutions on Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, they have not been implemented: several of them contain contradictions between their provisions and their objectives. Today, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina cited these very contradictions. The international community has proposed to the parties to the conflict a plan for an international settlement brokered by the two Co-Chairmen of the International Peace Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. Many of the Council's resolutions contain tacit approval of that plan, which had at the

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

time been accepted by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina and by the Croats.

The Security Council has on several occasions called upon the Serbian side to agree to the plan and to abide by it. That party, however, has ignored the demands of the international community and, in contravention of Security Council resolutions, has continued its aggression; it has thus acquired, by force, most of the territory, towns and villages of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. And still the Security Council has not forced the Serb side to abide by the Council's resolutions adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Today, my delegation - and, in fact, the international community as a whole - is asking itself the following question: what has become of the international will and international legitimacy when the resolutions of the Security Council go unimplemented? It is the credibility of this body that is at stake today. International legitimacy is also held hostage if the Council continues to accept having its resolutions held in contempt, if the members of the Council continue to take the easy way out and avoid the strong options - which would, of course, require fresh international efforts and perhaps some slight sacrifice to maintain international peace and security - and if the Council simply tries to find a realistic and "viable" solution which, frankly speaking, means bowing to and accepting the fait accompli imposed by the Serbian aggressor through military force and its major territorial gains.

The Security Council has adopted about 40 resolutions on the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Today, it is high time that the Council reconsidered its position and decided exactly what it should do now, at this very moment, taking into account two considerations: firstly, what the parameters are for

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

the necessary solution; and, secondly, when it approves any settlement plan, the fact that as long as the fighting goes on in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as long as there is an aggressor and a victim, any negotiated settlement that may be reached will be unjust and, therefore, not viable or lasting. Also, any settlement accepted by the international community must be based on the principles which underpin international law and international legitimacy, and those principles must be applied to all in an equitable manner and without double standards.

That is why my delegation regrets the recent attempts to impose a negotiated, unjust solution on the Muslim side, that is, on the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

The recently proposed partition plan sounds several alarm bells at the international level for the following reasons.

First, this plan means that the Security Council is reversing its stated position on the need to implement all its resolutions affirming the importance of preserving the territorial integrity and independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Let us recall that many of those resolutions were adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Secondly, the Muslims in the "safe areas" will live cut off in some sort of separate camps, which means the dismantling of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as an entity and the end of the real presence of a Muslim entity in that State.

Thirdly, accepting partition on the basis of fait accompli amounts to consecrating the results of aggression on the one hand and of "ethnic cleansing" on the other. This is in flagrant violation of international law as expressed in Security Council resolutions that affirm the rejection of territorial acquisition by force and "ethnic cleansing".

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a State Member of the United Nations. The Security Council must deal seriously with the tragedy faced by that State so that, on the eve of the twenty-first century, international silence does not become a stain on the conscience of humanity.

The logic of those who oppose lifting the arms embargo holds no water. If there really were a cease-fire in effect, obligatory for all parties, then and only then would the international community have to refrain from supplying all sides with arms. But the present situation is not like that. As long as the fighting continues and as long as one party possesses all kinds of heavy

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

weaponry while the other is defenceless, having not even the means to defend itself, the international community must intervene to protect the weaker party and allow it to exercise its right to self-defence.

The delegation of Egypt has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document S/25997; we call upon all Council members to adopt it.

The Security Council has not thus far put an end to the crimes being perpetrated in full view and with the full knowledge of the international community; it has not adopted a clear plan to put an end to the fighting; it has not decreed an immediate, mandatory cease-fire; it has not dispatched military forces to impose a cease-fire. The hostilities continue, and the aggressor, the stronger party, has made major territorial gains.

Allow me, therefore, to address some questions to the Council, questions that everyone is asking. Would the Security Council preserve some semblance of credibility if it failied to adopt strong measures to prevent this aggression? Who is occupying the land of others? Who is carrying out "ethnic cleansing"? Who is perpetrating the most ignoble war crimes imaginable?

The 15 members of the Security Council are now faced with a historic responsibility. My delegation hopes they will live up to its responsibility in order to preserve the Council's future credibility.

May we venture humbly to hope that the Security Council will lift the embargo so that the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a State Member of the United Nations, can be given a last chance to exercise its right to self-defence, a right enshrined in the Charter?

> "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence... ." (Article 51)

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

The adoption of today's resolution will demonstrate the Council's will to discharge its responsibilities under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. Will we continue to deny the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina their right to self-defence? It is up to the Council to decide that question.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Croatia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NOBILO (Croatia): I should like to take this opportunity to commend you, Mr. President, on your prudent and exceptional leadership in your capacity as President of the Security Council for the month of June.

The Republic of Croatia was the first country to provide assistance to the Bosnian Croats and Muslims in their legitimate defence against Serbian aggression and "ethnic cleansing". Most of the Muslims who escaped Serbian slaughter and fled to Croatia and other countries did so through the territory defended by Bosnian Croats. The Bosnian Croats even built the only road through the mountains in order to save the refugees and provide international humanitarian assistance. Croatia initiated defence cooperation with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was formalized in two agreements. Croatia has helped hundreds of thousands of Bosnian refugees to reach other countries and at present shelters 271,000 Muslim refugees on its soil.

Without the support of the Bosnian Croats at the referendum for the independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which the Serbs boycotted, the Bosnian Muslims would not have been able to win the vote alone. The tragic breakup of the Croatian-Muslim defence alliance started

(Mr. Nobilo, Croatia)

when 100,000 Muslim refugees, who were hosted in predominantly Croatian areas, were used by some Muslim political and military leaders to try to establish political and military control over the Croatian community of Herceg-Bosna, which was formed by the Bosnian Croats as a provisional structure to organize their defence and fill the legal and economic vacuum in the country.

The Bosnian Croat leaders, however, stated that they would be ready to abolish that structure once the Vance-Owen plan began to be implemented in the Croatian and Muslim provinces, as a start of the overall process. Unfortunately, the Security Council never endorsed the Vance-Owen plan, nor was it ready to enforce it. As a result, the divided international community was again humiliated by the Serbian obstruction of this plan, although they signed it in Athens on 2 May 1993. Similarly, the so called Cutileiro plan, which was most similar to the latest peace initiative for Bosnia and Herzegovina, was also signed by all three parties in March 1992, but President Izetbegovic later withdrew his signature. The divided international community shares the biggest responsibility for the anarchy that followed, in which all three sides are now fighting one another in order to secure living space.

The fact that Muslims have, unfortunately, been the principal victims of Serbian aggression in the former Yugoslavia does not give them the right to continue with their policy of "ethnic cleansing" in central Bosnia, from which tens of thousands of Croats have been expelled and where thousands have been killed.

(Mr. Nobilo, Croatia)

Regrettably, the Security Council has never discussed this humanitarian tragedy affecting the Croats in central Bosnia. Some local units of the Croatian Defence Council (HVO) are now finding themselves and their families enclosed in pockets which are surrounded by rampaging Muslim forces, causing local commanders to adopt emergency measures that, although contradictory to the stated HVO policy, represent desperate acts aimed at pure survival.

The international community must stop the tragedy which is occurring in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. But we do not believe that providing more arms to the Bosnian Muslims would accomplish that purpose. Of course, the imposition of the arms embargo against the victims of Serbian aggression was a wrong decision. Particularly cynical was the decision of the international mediators to allow the withdrawal of most of the arsenal of the Yugoslav army from Slovenia and Croatia to Bosnia and Herzegovina. My Government has supported the lifting of the arms embargo as a measure complementary to an international military intervention which would provide air and naval support for the joint defence efforts of the Bosnian Croats and Muslims, which would be conducted in cooperation with the Republic of Croatia. Unfortunately, this solution was not accepted, nor was our offer to put observers along all the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Faced with these realities, Croatia has launched a peace initiative designed to preserve the international sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina while reorganizing it into three confederal units. What we need is a Switzerland of the Balkans and not a new Lebanon in the heart of Europe.

(Mr. Nobilo, Croatia)

Unfortunately, after all the destruction and horrible crimes which have been committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, there are no ideal solutions which present themselves. We need acceptable solutions for all three constitutive nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially for the Muslims, who have suffered the most in this war. The Croatian peace initiative is the last chance to end the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We ask the international community to call on all sides to adhere strictly to the cease-fire agreement of 15 June. We also ask the international community to urge President Izetbegovic to join the other members of the collective presidency at the negotiating table in Geneva and to support the plan for peace.

If there is to be a lifting of the arms embargo, the Croatian Government can only support a general lifting for all the victims of Serbian aggression. A selective approach to this issue will only aggravate the ongoing situation, and it would only mean more war in Bosnia. My Government is not prepared to be an endless hostage to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is blocking the attainment of peace in the occupied territories of the Republic of Croatia.

We also believe that there will be no genuine and lasting peace in the region until the territorial integrity of all Member States in the region is fully respected and their peaceful coexistence and cooperation are restored.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Croatia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Malaysia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): The Malaysian delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council for giving us the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

There have been more than 40 resolutions adopted by the Security Council since 1991 to address aggression and genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina. None of these resolutions has been effectively implemented. Basically, the Council has failed in its responsibility under Article 24 of the Charter to take prompt and effective action to restore international peace and stability.

The choice for the Security Council in addressing the Bosnian issue now, when genocide continues and a Member of the United Nations is being dismembered is clear: either it takes more determined and concrete action in accordance with its primary responsiblity under Article 24 of the Charter, using all the powers available under Chapter VII; or it lifts the arms embargo, which will allow the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to exercise its inherent right to individual and collective self-defence. No one can dispute the fact that the arms embargo in reality has affected only the Bosnians, and the Council's denial of the exercise of this right has led to the slaughtering of the Bosnians, denying them their most fundamental right - that is, the right to life itself. It should be pointed out that the application of the arms embargo on the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is wrongly directed, as resolution 713 (1991) was adopted before the Republic became independent of former Yugoslavia and joined as the one hundred and seventieth Member of the United Nations, on 22 May 1992.

Coming to the Council once again, the Malaysian delegation finds it necessary to appeal to the conscience and moral judgement of each member of the Council over what further steps have to be taken to save Bosnia and

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Herzegovina. The members of the Council must take into account two resolutions of the General Assembly - resolution 46/242 and resolution 47/121 - that were adopted with big majorities and that underlined the collective stand that the Bosnians must be allowed to have recourse to arms to defend themselves. Recently, at the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, a special declaration with a direct appeal to the Security Council was adopted, calling for the lifting of the arms embargo for the Bosnians. Council members cannot dismiss out of hand or be oblivious of the moral question before them: can a handful of countries in the Security Council continue to not even reconsider the possibility of reviewing the arms embargo, in the light of a huge chorus of appeals from the international community?

Regrettably, the intransigent position of a few countries is the obstacle to a review of resolution 713 (1991). Bosnia and Herzegovina, ironically enough and with tragic consequences, is a problem in Europe that Europeans have failed to solve but they are, at the same time, insistent that there can be no other means except those undertaken by certain countries of Europe themselves. We are seeing now the realization of our worst fears as a result of that situation: the virtual abandonment of the Vance-Owen plan in favour of the Milosevic-Tudjman proposal for the partitioning of Bosnia and Herzegovina into three states based on ethnic lines. Although full details of the proposal are not yet available, its acceptance means legitimizing Serbian acquisition of territory through the use of force and the abhorrent practice of ethnic cleansing.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

As we meet here at United Nations Headquarters in New York, the Serbians and Croatians are launching joint attacks to grab more territory by force, in fulfilment of the Milosevic-Tudjman plan to dismember Bosnia and Herzegovina. Europe must realize full well that what the Serbs and Croats want is a total surrender by the Bosnian Muslims.

My delegation would also appeal to individual Council members to examine again the premise behind the decision to adopt resolution 713 (1991) on the arms embargo. That resolution was predicated on the Security Council's being able to take effective steps to stop the strife and push back aggression. Those things never happened. On the contrary, at a cost borne by hundreds of thousands, and with immense tragedy, the dismemberment of Bosnia is in progress. Is resolution 713 (1991) still applicable to the Bosnians who are fighting for their lives? There is an argument being promoted that lifting the arms embargo for the Bosnians would lead to a greater escalation of violence, would affect humanitarian efforts and would threaten the concept of safe havens. My delegation appeals to Council members to examine this argument clearly. What further intensifications of fighting can one envisage when already there have been thousands killed and the Bosnians are huddled pitifully in places of refuge and their territory has shrunk into divided pockets of survival? What humanitarian efforts are we to safeguard when humanitarianism has been totally abandoned by an appeasement policy that has allowed armies their full sway? What is the future of safe havens when the rest of Bosnia and Herzegovina is being allowed to be swallowed up?

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

The single thrust of this draft resolution today is to give the Bosnians their inherent right under Article 51 to defend themselves. The draft resolution before us today is not expected to be adopted because a handful of members continue to insist that they must determine the course of action on the issue. Other Council members must reject this highly untenable situation now and restore to the Bosnians their right to self-defense.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ABU ODEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): It is on behalf of the Arab Group, of which my country has the honour to be Chairman for this month, that I have asked to speak at this meeting devoted to a general debate on the armed conflict that continues to rage in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Before I take up the subject, permit me first to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to express the confidence of the Arab Group in your wisdom, skills, experience and leadership. Please permit me also to express the gratitude and appreciation of the Arab Group to your predecessor, Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov of the Russian Federation, for the skill and ability he demonstrated in guiding the deliberations of the Council during his presidency last month.

This is not the first time that the Council has devoted a meeting to a debate on the tragic situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. If anything, this fact simply demonstrates the failure of the resolutions adopted by the Council to put and end to aggression against this helpless country, to check the aggressor and to nullify the consequences of its aggression.

(Mr. Abu Odeh, Jordan)

I do not want to recount the facts, which by their very nature, sequence and evolution, have come to be known today as the first human tragedy of the post-cold-war world. Suffice it to say that the systematic killing, displacement and "ethnic cleansing" inflicted upon the Muslim people of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the violation of the human dignity of its men, women and children have reached a level that will stigmatize humanity for many centuries to come. This aspect of the Bosnian tragedy, however, is only its first chapter.

The second chapter is characterized by the prevarication of the United Nations beating about the bush, unable to take any steps forward - steps provided for in the Charter - while the Serbian aggression was escalating and continues to escalate. The abject failure of the United Nations to carry out the duties entrusted to it by the Charter has brought about a strange paradox that can be neither overlooked nor denied. This paradox is best manifested in the fact that the more the Serbian aggression escalates the more the United Nations retreats. This fact has been reflected not only in the expansion and intensification of the Serbian aggression and the increase in the number of aggressors, but also in the ongoing peace efforts themselves and in the features of the proposed peace plans, which are being altered so as to serve the fait accompli created by the success of aggression. If this rhythm continues, the end result may be not only the displacement of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the infliction upon them of all kinds of pain and suffering but also the destruction of their Republic and its disappearance from the international map. The United Nations will then become a witness to death and extinction rather than a protector of life and survival.

(Mr. Abu Odeh, Jordan)

Why has the situation reached this tragic and dangerous level? There are many different interpretations of this, some public, others hidden. Numerous as they are, the public arguments boil down to the fact that influential and powerful countries, as is well known to everybody, have seen fit to deal with the tragedy of Bosnia and Herzegovina within the framework of their financial calculations and perceived interests, completely ignoring their ethical, moral and legal responsibilities, as well as all the grandiose slogans they proclaim here at the United Nations about laying the foundations of a world in which security and freedom can prevail and in which nations can pursue the goals of development and prosperity. Why have these Governments deviated and adopted this standard, despite the fact that it is clearly incompatible with the basic responsibilities of the United Nations and the Security Council in particular? The answer to that is not known, and it must be included among the hidden reasons.

While the Serbs and the Security Council are the protagonists of the first and second chapters of the tragedy of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the whole world is being pushed against its will to be the protagonist of the third, which has yet to be written although it has gradually begun to take shape already. If the United Nations continues to act by the same rhythm that has brought the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina to its current stage, and if the Security Council continues to beat about the bush or to mark time, the third chapter will be written and the tragedy will be complete. Its dimensions will go beyond the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina to encompass all the peoples of the world. Thus will be dissipated the hopes that these people cherished as they entered the post-cold-war era, to be replaced by misgivings about the new world order. These misgivings will be reflected in a number of valid questions.

(Mr. Abu Odeh, Jordan)

Is there more than one possible reading of the Charter of the United Nations? Is the double standard in dealing with international problems the rule and even-handedness the exception? What will be the fate of small nations? What will be the fate of weak States adjacent to powerful ones? Is the persistent call for the protection of human rights a serious one or is it a political ploy? Are we justified in hoping for international cooperation and interdependence? Must the national security of a State be enmeshed in the intensification of great-Power interests in the country, even at the expense of the development and prosperity of its people? Are we sliding into an abyss of neo-colonialism as we approach the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations? Do Muslims have a special status - a negative one - in international relations? Must we announce to our peoples that the world is returning to the Middle Ages and not approaching the threshold of the twenty-first century?

Does the Security Council realize the ramifications of grudges among peoples, especially if they accumulate on a religous basis, at a time when socio-economic frustrations are growing? Will the United Nations bring about the fulfilment of the prophecy of the American political scientist Samuel Huntington, who argues that the conflicts of the post-cold-war era will flare up along the fault lines of civilizations, Islam being one of them? What will the new world order look like if these are its features? Can we trust it? Indeed, can it be established on solid foundations? Is it really possible to deal with the various urgent issues that crowd the international agenda? Lastly, what will be the fate of international peace and security?

(Mr. Abu Odeh, Jordan)

The misgivings on these questions are the salient features of chapter III in the tragedy of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Arab States, which uphold the Charter of the United Nations and abide by its provisions, do not wish to see this chapter written, because they want to live in a world where peace and security prevail and where confidence in its international institutions is widely felt. They see that the path to that world is still open and that the Council still has the opportunity to prevent the tragedy from reaching its horrible conclusion. The features of this path, as seen by the Arab States, are numerous. The most outstanding is the exemption of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina from Security Council resolution 713 (1991), which bans the shipment of arms to the former Yugoslavia.

It is most ironic to say that the exemption of the Republic of Bosnia Herzegovina from that resolution would only increase the number of killings and losses. To say that would mean only one thing: to tolerate the killing of Bosnian Muslims and not to accept the killing of Serbian aggressors. So let the victim bleed, but the aggressor must remain healthy and sound. What kind of logic is that? Do those who uphold this option suppose that the continued bleeding of the Bosnian people will evoke mercy in the heart of the Serbian aggressor who perpetrates the crimes of "ethnic cleansing", thereby motivating it to stop its aggression?

It is high time, Mr. President, for your Council to stop denying the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina its legitimate right of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. There is not one reasonable argument that can convince us of the validity of the opinion that calls for denying the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina the right to self-defence.

(Mr. Abu Odeh, Jordan)

It was understood right from the beginning that the adoption of the arms embargo resolution, resolution 713 (1991) by the Security Council implied that the United Nations itself would undertake on behalf of the victim the task of repelling the aggressor. As this has not so far been the case, the Council's continuation of the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina means that the United Nations does not respect its Charter and that dealing with Muslims is based on another handbook.

Does the Security Council intend to establish this perception? Is this the way to consolidate the foundations of international peace and security?

In conclusion, Sir, I wish your Council every success.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Jordan for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. SNOUSSI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Since the outbreak of the armed conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina the situation has only become worse. The suffering and the loss of human lives have increased, despite the efforts of the international community and the measures adopted by the Security Council, the principal organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security. This terrible, continued deterioration of the situation is still a major concern for my country and all other countries committed, as we are, to the principles of the Charter.

This grave threat to international peace and security has become a major concern for the international community, which has been called upon to take the appropriate measures in the framework of the system of collective security to put an end to aggression and prevent an expansion of the conflict. The international community in fact faces a very serious situation in which the sovereignty, territorial integrity and very existence of a young State Member

(Mr. Snoussi, Morocco)

of our Organization, Bosnia and Herzegovina, are seriously threatened, in flagrant violation of the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

The impressive number of resolutions, some under Chapter VII of the Charter, and the no less impressive number of presidential statements, demonstrate, if it were necessary to demonstrate this, that the Security Council and other United Nations organs have done everything possible to do their duty and face up to what is, tragically, a runaway situation. A peace-keeping force has been deployed and a sanctions regime has been decreed, permitting some reduction in human suffering, thanks to the distribution of humanitarian aid in conditions that are often dangerous.

The international community responded spontaneously by sending contingents to support the distribution of aid and, now, to protect the safe areas. My delegation takes this opportunity to express its appreciation of the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General and the two Co-Chairmen of the London Conference, and we pay a warm tribute to the men and women of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and the personnel of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and humanitarian organizations working in that country, for their attitude, for the sacrifice and courage they have constantly shown in the past two years, risking their lives and braving every danger to perform their duties.

Despite all that, our appeals have not been heeded; the aggressor has disregarded our statements and resolutions, which have remained a dead letter. In fact, contrary to all the Council's decisions, the Serbs continue cynically to implement their policy of "ethnic cleansing", expelling Muslim populations and occupying territory. They have thus occupied more than two

(Mr. Snoussi, Morocco)

thirds of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, caused the loss of more than 150,000 human lives and forced more than a million people to leave the country. Furthermore, even resolutions adopted to ensure the distribution of relief have been violated daily by the Serbs.

In recent days the violence has intensified in central Bosnia. This time the Croats have added their violence to that long perpetrated by the Serbs. Devastation and massacres of civilian populations - particularly of the Muslim peoples - are increasing. According to the latest information from the Secretariat, humanitarian aid is now encountering insurmountable obstacles, and there is a danger of its not being distributed if vigorous measures are not taken immediately.

In brief, the international community, which is responsible for ensuring the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina, has not, unfortunately, succeeded in implementing measures decided on, and the mission of the United Nations organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security has been constantly blocked by the intransigence of the Serbs, who take advantage of their military superiority to pursue the shameful policy of "ethnic cleansing" and occupation based on intolerance and hate.

We had hoped that the process of a peaceful settlement, begun at the London Conference, would put an end to the tragedy of the Bosnians. Sadly, the situation has gone from bad to worse. The international community does not want to, and must not, reward aggression and give legitimacy to faits accomplis.

The arms embargo decreed by the Security Council with a view to reducing the violence and suffering has never, unfortunately, had any effect on either

(Mr. Snoussi, Morocco)

the Serbs or the Croats. On the contrary, it has increased the Serbs military superiority and intensified their intransigence and their bellicose stance. As long as this imbalance exists the Serbs will continue to impose their conditions and refuse to compromise, as they have with respect to the Vance-Owen Plan, which they have killed. They are now trying to substitute for it a machiavellian plan for dismemberment, which is no more and no less than a repudiation of 40 resolutions, 40 statements, which we uphold and in which we have always said that Bosnian sovereignty is sacred.

The legitimate Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has suffered most from the arms embargo. Lacking the means for defence, that Government has not, unfortunately, succeeded in maintaining its territorial integrity or ensuring respect for its independence, still less its sovereignty.

(Mr. Snoussi, Morocco)

Nor has the international community been able to help the Bosnian Government succeed, although that Government deserved encouragement for its cooperation and flexibility during the Vance-Owen talks.

In these circumstances, we believe that authorizing the Bosnian Government to acquire the means to defend its civilian population would help deter the Serbs from their aggression and their policy of occupation. This new measure should be coupled with other deterrent measures we have considered with a view to convincing the Serbs to abandon their sordid designs. Indeed, the right of self-defence is formally embodied in Article 51 of the Charter, which states that

> "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations".

In the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, several Security Council resolutions have recognized that that State Member of the United Nations is indeed the victim of Serbian hostilities, which have not been ended by the measures adopted by the Security Council.

It is therefore essential to supplement those measures by authorizing Bosnia and Herzegovina to obtain the means needed for self-defence and exempting it from the provisions of resolution 713 (1991), which puts in place the embargo. To avoid any distortions or harmful effects, the lifting of the arms embargo should be accompanied by possible strengthened monitoring of the sanctions regime to prevent the Serbian aggressors from continuing to acquire additional weapons or additional territory.

(Mr. Snoussi, Morocco)

This action must supplement, not negate measures already adopted by the Security Council. Lifting the embargo will certainly discourage the Serbs from attacking the safe areas we have established.

In our view, this is likely to bring about the balance needed to ensure that negotiations lead to a compromise solution that could preserve the territorial integrity and independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Let there be no doubt: we support lifting the embargo because we view this as a logical defensive measure. As we have been unable to defend Bosnia we must at least allow it to defend itself.

Unfortunately, this is an act of despair. We want to lift the embargo because we have been able to do nothing else we had wished to do. The Bosnians have always been a peace-loving people, but they have been invaded and dispossessed; their women have been raped; they have been placed in concentration camps; the Serbs have taken everything. Today like yesterday the Bosnians do not want war; they merely want to live. It is in our power to give them that right; we cannot refuse it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the representative of Albania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SHKURTI (Albania): As this is my first statement before the Council during your presidency, Sir, allow me to congratulate you on your successful work during this month. I should also like to pay a tribute to Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov of the Russian Federation for his skilful guidance of the Council during its deliberations last month.

(Mr. Shkurti, Albania)

For a long time the international community has been shocked at what is going on in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since the day the aggression against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina started, the situation on the ground has remained the same. Massive killing of Muslims as a result of fighting and the heavy daily shelling of Muslim-inhabited areas; "ethnic cleansing" carried out by force of arms; massive destruction of the homes and property of Muslims; genocide against them; massive rape of Muslim women; the tragic humanitarian situation prevailing in Bosnia and Herzegovina: those are some of the elements and consequences of the tragedy going on in that country.

The aggression and the civil war there have put at stake the very existence of a State Member of the world Organization. The efforts of the international community to bring about peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina have proved ineffective. The Security Council has adopted a great number of resolutions concerning the Yugoslav crisis and the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but they have all been unavailing.

The Security Council, however, conscious of its responsibility under Chapter VII of the Charter, should take the appropriate steps, with a view to bringing the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina to an immediate end. We hold that a just solution to the conflict in that country should be based on the following principles: immediate cessation of hostilities; withdrawal from the occupied territories; international guarantees of the return of refugees to their homes; restoration of the territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the immediate trial of the perpetrators of crimes of genocide and of grave breaches of international humanitarian law.

(Mr. Shkurti, Albania)

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina must be allowed to exercise its inherent right to self-defence, as embodied in Article 51 of the Charter. The Security Council must at least lift the arms embargo against the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, thus giving the unarmed Muslim people the opportunity to defend themselves and contributing to their survival, which is at a critical point today.

The adoption of the proposed draft resolution would be a clear signal to the Serbs that the international community is no longer going to tolerate the massacres in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The failure of the international community to bring an end to the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina could on the one hand encourage the Serbs to continue the war to achieve a "Greater Serbia" and on the other encourage them to expand the massacres in other areas of the former Yugoslavia, such as Kosovo, where the situation is extremely grave and explosive.

The international community must, in a timely and appropriate manner, act to stop aggressive Serbian nationalism in order to prevent a Balkan war with grave consequences for the region.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Albania for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Indonesia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): Let me at the outset extend my delegation's congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that under your able guidance, the Council's deliberations will be brought to a successful conclusion.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

I should like also to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov of the Russian Federation, for the able guidance and leadership he provided to the Council last month.

Let me also take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the members of the Council for giving us the opportunity to participate in this debate.

It is with a deepening sense of distress and grief that we in the Non-Aligned Movement have watched the tragedy that is unfolding in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ever since the eruption of hostilities more than a year ago, a State Member of the United Nations has been subjected to unabated aggression, with a horrendous toll in human life and material devastation. We have witnessed systematic attempts progressively to decimate a people through the unconscionable policy of "ethnic cleansing" and the massive violation of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. Consequently, two thirds of Bosnian territory has now come under Serbian occupation, while the few remaining towns under Bosnian control are under relentless bombardment, resulting in even more death and destruction, forced expulsions, mass starvation and the denial of desperately needed humanitarian aid and assistance.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

For over a year now, the Council has been seized of the rapidly deteriorating situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and has adopted numerous resolutions, always in the hope of terminating the conflict. Thus, the embargo on weapons, the imposition of economic sanctions, the ban on military flights over Bosnia's air space, as well as the decision to facilitate humanitarian aid and the establishment of safe areas, have justifiably heightened the expectations of many Member States that those measures would suffice to end the aggression, halt the genocide and end the forcible land grab. To our profound regret, however, those decisions have been met with contempt and scorn, and have emboldened the aggressors to intensify the brutalization of a defenceless people, particularly when the Council demurred at taking enforcement action.

The announcement of the Joint Action Programme last month in Washington has further compounded the situation. We have serious doubts concerning how effective it will be to implement the Vance-Owen plan on a step-by-step basis, which is the concept underlying the Joint Action Programme.

Furthermore, the cynical plan advanced by the aggressors would partition Bosnia and Herzegovina in utter disregard of the sacrosanct principle of the inviolability of the territorial integrity of States and would herd its people into less than a tenth of their territory: it is a blatant attempt to divide Bosnia and Herzegovina along ethnic lines and create States-within-a-State that would take the Bosnian Serbs closer to their proclaimed goal of an independent State that would ultimately link with the former Yugoslavia to form a "Greater Serbia". It would codify and reward aggression; it would result in an enforced transfer of population; it would ignite an already explosive situation and further undermine the stability of the region. Hence,

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

we should categorically reject the insidious design to partition Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In my Government's view, a settlement of the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina can brook no further delay. We can no longer procrastinate. Of immediate importance are the implementation of an effective cease-fire; the reinforcement of humanitarian operations; an end to the bombardment of civilian populations and the surrender of heavy weapons to the peace-keeping forces. Furthermore, the Vance-Owen plan, along with its constitutional principles, the provisional map, interim as well as peace arrangements, must be implemented, as it constitutes a viable modality for peacefully resolving the conflict.

The plan spells out terms for a cease-fire, the separation of combatants and the demilitarisation of the country. Taken together, the plan and its principles recognize that Bosnia and Herzegovina will be a decentralized State, with most governing functions to be carried out by the provinces. Although the plan represents an enforced compromise between the aggressors and their victims, the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has nonetheless accepted the proposals contained therein in the cause of peace and of saving lives.

The Government and people of Bosnia and Herzegovina have been subjected to continued and intensified bombardment while Bosnians have been deprived of their inherent right to self-defence. How long will the international community tolerate killings, murder and genocide against the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina while the Serbs make a mockery of the efforts to attain a peaceful settlement of the crisis? Since the international community - or some of its members - has been unwilling or unable to defeat the aggression

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

perpetrated against a sovereign State, there is a moral responsibility not to deny that State the right to defend itself.

The arms embargo was in fact instrumental in facilitating the land grab, the "ethnic cleansing" and the process towards the creation of a "Greater Serbia". Thus, the arms embargo has proven to be largely ineffective in ending the Serbian onslaught: it has tied the hands of Bosnian Muslims in the face of the overwhelming military advantage enjoyed by the Bosnian Serbs, and has enabled the Bosnian Serbs to proceed with their devious plans, which are devoid of any humanitarian considerations.

Lifting the arms embargo would render the Serbian policy of territorial acquisition by the use of force much more costly; hence, the contention that even a selective lifting of the embargo would be counter-productive and might even lead to a widening of the conflict can no longer be sustained. At a minimum, therefore, the embargo against the Bosnian Government should be lifted.

Against the backdrop of the grave situation prevailing in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the World Conference on Human Rights held this month in Vienna adopted a special declaration and urged the Security Council to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter, especially those under Article 24, and thereby restore the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In conclusion, Indonesia and other non-aligned countries are firmly committed to the peaceful settlement of disputes. We believe that a renewal of dialogue in good faith is essential to resolve this crisis and that a negotiated solution within the framework of appropriate international

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

mechanisms is still within reach. But it is self-evident that the aggressors have become increasingly brazen and contemptuous of those who are trying to end the carnage; hence, the Council can no longer remain passive in the face of the defiance or flouting of the international will. The decisions taken now may well reverberate beyond the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina and determine the course of events in the post-cold-war era. The imperative need, then, is the for the United Nations peace-keeping forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina to be strengthened for enforcement action under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

The draft resolution of the non-aligned caucus now before the Council reaffirms the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I fully concur with the statement made by the coordinator of the caucus when he so eloquently introduced the draft resolution. The draft resolution also calls for the arms embargo to be lifted for the sole purpose of enabling Bosnia and Herzegovina to exercise its inherent right to self-defence. It is my delegation's earnest hope that this draft resolution, if implemented in full, will lead to an immediate end to this agonizing conflict and will also provide a long-term solution to the crisis.

I am pleased to convey the request of my Government that Indonesia be included in the list of sponsors of draft resolution S/25997.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Indonesia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement now.

Mr. BURCUOĞLU (Turkey): On several occasions in the past year, and most recently on 4 June, we voiced, before this body, our deep anguish over the inability of the Security Council to protect the Bosnian Muslims from genocide and to act effectively against Serbian defiance of Security Council resolutions. We called for the use of force to stop Serbian aggression if resolutions adopted by the Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter were incapable of doing so, and we stressed that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be exempted without delay from the arms embargo so long as the ruthless attacks on the defenceless Muslims continued unabated.

The Council is finally considering, at a crucial moment, whether it will acknowledge the inherent right of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a State Member of the United Nations, to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter, and allow the Bosnian Muslims to meet their legitimate defence needs. We commend the members of the non-aligned caucus for submitting the draft resolution contained in document S/25997 on the exemption of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the arms embargo. We strongly support the draft resolution, which we have also decided to co-sponsor.

(Mr. Burcuoğlu, Turkey)

The World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna just recently made a consensus appeal to the Security Council to take the necessary measures to end the genocide taking place in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Along with many others, including two resolutions of the General Assembly, this appeal would not have been necessary had the Security Council taken up the challenge and responded adequately to the Serbian aggression. It is precisely the lack of such decisive action that has encouraged the aggressors to drive the imperilled Bosnian Muslims into practical extinction. The Security Council must now fulfil its moral and legal obligations under the Charter and heed the united appeal made by the international community in Vienna. Abandoning the Bosnian Muslims to the mercy of the aggressors would be acting against the will of the membership of the United Nations, which the Security Council, under article 24 of the Charter, represents. The will of a large majority of members of the United Nations to lift the arms embargo was reflected in General Assembly resolution 47/121 and, most recently, in the Declaration adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights. The Security Council must act accordingly and no longer deny the Bosnian Government its right to defend itself .

In practical terms, the arms embargo imposed on the former Yugoslavia by resolution 713 (1991) has affected only the Bosnian Government. We all know that the other parties to the conflict have vast means to arm themselves. While the Council has reaffirmed on several occasions, in words if not in deeds, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and rejected the acquisition of territory through the use of force and the practice of "ethnic cleansing", it cannot remain indifferent to the right of that country, whose very existence is at stake, to procure defensive weaponry. My Government cannot accept such inconsistencies.

(Mr. Burcuoğlu, Turkey)

The concept of "safe areas" was based on the expectation that resolutions establishing them would be effectively and immediately implemented. If the Serbs are allowed to shell these "safe areas", impede the delivery of humanitarian assistance to them, block the flow of vital water supplies and continue to face no consequences for their crimes, what credibility will the Council have as the protector of the Muslim population "imprisoned" in these areas? Why should the Muslim population confined as refugees in "safe areas" - together with those living in "non-safe areas" - be denied the right to defend themselves, while their aggressors move freely about and prepare for the final kill? What logic is there in declaring safe enclaves if they continue to be attacked?

Those opposed to lifting the arms embargo must accept the fact that the Bosnian nation is now being slowly exterminated by its neighbours seeking to legitimize territorial acquisitions made through the use of brutal force and the genocidal practice of "ethnic cleansing". The Vance-Owen plan has now been mutilated and killed, leaving the Security Council face to face with the eventual outcome of acknowledging defeat by surrogate thugs and warlords. The carving up of Bosnia has been brought closer. We believe it would be fair to ask under what authority the Co-Chairmen appear to be involved in an exercise designed to dismember the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are awaiting a strong reaction from the Council to this deviation.

With what faith remains in us, we earnestly hope that wisdom will prevail, that the Bosnian Muslims will be granted rightful protection by the international community and that their inherent right to self-defence will be recognized. Thereafter we shall draw the necessary conclusions on whether the Security Council is truly representative of the will of the international

(Mr. Burcuoğlu, Turkey)

Community or whether it will legitimize the rule of might over right. Turkey is convinced that at this critical juncture the international community bears not only the responsibility for what has happened so far in Bosnia and Herzegovina but also the responsibility for shaping Europe and the world of the twenty-first century.

No natter what today's deliberations yield, Turkey shall continue to pursue actively the course of justice and legitimacy to support the beleaguered and brave people of Bosnia and Herzegovina in their struggle for survival.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the representative of Afghanistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) (interpretation from French): I congratulate you, Mr President, on your outstanding leadership of the work of the Council during the month of June.

Once again we are considering a very sensitive point of contemporary history that touches the international community, especially the United Nations and the Security Council. In this particular case the Council has shown a tendency to diverge from the conception of it held by peoples that have believed in the United Nations. Peoples want to believe that the United Nations will clearly and vigorously support the cause of justice in the face of injustice.

The facts show that, quite to the contrary, such is often not the course of action chosen by the Security Council. Does the Security Council not tend systematically to take refuge in morally vapid half-measures, as if there were a need to strike a balance between justice and injustice, as if the question

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

were one of equating aggression and resistance to aggression, between aggressor and aggrieved.

The great Powers know perfectly well that the Milosevic regime in Belgrade and the Serbian regular forces and militias are the indisputable authors of the overwhelming majority human rights abuses, atrocities and killings that have taken place in Bosnia. To say that the various parties to the conflict share responsibility for large numbers of atrocities and war crimes and that they are thus responsible to the same degree is to resort to sophistry in order to provide an excuse for doing nothing to face up to the Bosnian Serbs, who continue to commit these atrocities and crimes. The great Powers are officially and perfectly well informed about the war crimes committed by the Bosnian Serbs.

Let us recall that following the Second World War the Yugoslav army was the largest Communist army in Eastern Europe, second only to that of the Soviet Union. It remained a large army, and in recent years Milosevic and the partisans of his regime, who are chauvinistic expansionists, have made the Yugoslav army the essential instrument for the creation of a "greater Serbia and for fighting against non-Serbs in Croatia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia and Vojvodina.

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

Over these years, an infernal war machine has been set up by the Serbs in the former Yugoslavia, and particularly in Bosnia. Enormous sums have been spent to establish Serb militias in Bosnia. That is the kind of barbarism we have at the end of the twentieth century in Europe.

The majority of the Yugoslav army's officer corps has been made up of Serbian nationals, and an almost inexhaustible arsenal of weapons is made available to the militias; it has been piling up for years. The United Nations embargo has had no effect on the racist, chauvinistic plan for Greater Serbia. They have enough weapons to continue this carnage for years.

Let us be clear about this: the embargo is in fact practised against the Bosnian Muslims and is implemented by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In fact, this is potentially indirect military assistance to the Bosnian Serbs.

So, are we really to have the same concern for the occupier as for the occupied, if not more? Are we to go so far as to spare the attacker as much as the victim? Are we to go to the point of having as much concern for the Bosnian Serb aggressors as for the Bosnians who are being attacked, interned and executed and whose ancestral homes are being dynamited and places of worship being burned - this people that is witnessing the systematic breaking up and dismemberment of its territory?

The international community never tires of hiding behind methods of compromise and accommodation, of engaging in machinations and deals at the expense of a single victim nation. And it goes even further: it has as much regard for the person who rapes as for the person who is raped. Deprived of the means of defending itself, a country fights for its honour - and thus for the honour of the human being, of Europe and of the international community - while the aggressor is already armed to the teeth. All this is, of course,

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

a way for the great Powers of the world just to let things happen and let things alone, going so far as to become witnesses - so-called impartial witnesses - to the carnage committed against the moral and spiritual conscience of mankind.

That is the tragic panorama, sometimes described - as was done today by the representative of Bosnia - as deafening silence. It is also called a "double standard". But in fact it is simply injustice.

Let us put an end to all this. Let us put an end to this mentality which preaches that the arms embargo should be applied equally to those who use it to kill - those who, moreover, are already well armed - and to those who need the arms to defend themselves. To equate the perpetrator of the crime with the victim would only be tacit complicity with the criminal. Such complicity is shocking at the end of the twentieth century when we are faced with war crimes and genocide. History will remember this; it will remember the tacit complicity of the Powers of our times.

Let us put an end to this mentality and this attitude, examples of which we see in the case - among others - of my country, Afghanistan. A large part of the documents coming from the United Nations on the invasion of Afghanistan by the former Soviet Union were characterized by this mentality of arranging texts in such a way as to make a fundamentally unequal equation between the agressor and the victim of the aggression. That left 1,700,000 victims in Afghanistan, and almost totally destroyed the country's economy. And now, after the end of the cold war, life is hell in Bosnia, where the Muslims are suffering the same kind of carnage as took place in Afhanistan.

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

Thus, does the end of the cold war mean that small nations are to be sacrificed at the altar of a peace arranged between the large nations? Are we now in a phase of history when witnessing the death throes of a people has become the habitual attitude of the powerful of our world?

During the past few months, every time a positive solution has been put forward in the form of an idea or a draft, every time a particular method has evolved and has been judged effective, its adoption has been postponed because one, two or three great Powers have not had the agreement of their Government. This is procrastination established in the form of indecision, of obvious lack of determination hidden under the pretext of realism and even so-called wisdom. All this has turned the Security Council into a semi-attentive spectator that closes its eyes to genocide and war crimes.

We hear talk about the new reality - the Ambassador of Bosnia reminded us of this. The most recent new reality consists in leaving the Bosnian Muslims in zones which, practically speaking, would be concentration camps.

It will soon be a half century since the United Nations was established. The Organization has, to be sure, rendered important service to mankind. But in regard to formerly occupied Afghanistan, in regard to Bosnia, the victim of ethnic - or, actually, religious - aggression, the Security Council has been an instrument for depriving the victim of the possiblity of obtaining the means to defend itself. If that is indeed the role of this principal organ of the United Nations, the conscience of mankind will have to quote the following Arab proverb to the Organization: "You are certainly in a valley, but I am in quite another one". But the conscience of mankind and the conscience of this Organization should be together, in the same valley. It is up to the great Powers to bring this about.

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

As long ago as 16 November 1992, the delegation of Afghanistan stated to the Security Council that resolution 713 (1991), adopted in September 1991 - the resolution at the basis of the problem - did not pertain to Bosnia and Herzegovina at that time and continued not to pertain to Bosnia because the question of the war in Bosnia emerged in April 1992. In September 1991 it was a question of an armed conflict between Croatia and Serbia.

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

The resolution of September 1991 specifically refers to a certain Yugoslavia, which legally no longer exists. The text of resolution 713 (1991) is therefore null and void. The only priority of the jurists of these countries, on this and other points as well, is the policies of their Governments. Thus, legally, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (S/25997) before us today, of which we are a co-sponsor, simply clarifies the fact that the resolution of September 1991 does not concern Bosnia and Herzegovina.

History will show with sadness and astonishment that while, in a historic capital of Europe, Vienna, the representatives of European countries and the great Powers were preaching about human rights, in the Security Council in New York not one important country dared to say that the Muslims of Bosnia have a right to live and hence the right to possess the means of defending their lives against these over-armed aggressors. On 19 April, my delegation, in reference to the arms embargo, told the Security Council:

> "It must be made possible for Bosnian Muslims to untie their hands, to receive arms in order to defend their lives and the honour of humanity." (S/PV.3201, p. 72)

On that day, my delegation also said that the sanctions of resolution 820 (1993), of 7 April, are inadequate and insufficient. We said that the text hinted at certain timid, hesitant measures which some powerful countries call "realism" - a realism that does nothing but allow the Bosnian Serbs a free hand.

The Security Council is shouldering a great responsibility. Let us recall what happened at Versailles in the aftermath of the First World War. The injustice committed and tolerated in the case of some peoples of Europe

(Mr. Farhadi, Afghanistan)

and the Middle East was the source of tragic events a few decades later, events which exacted a heavy cost on Europe and the world. It is important that we draw a lesson from history. What is happening in Bosnia can happen, as has just been stated by the representative of Albania, in neighbouring territories. Europe and the international community will suffer the consequences. Let us therefore stop allowing the Serb aggressor to make dead letters of all the decisions of the United Nations. Let us stop allowing free rein to the aggressor. Let us allow Bosnia to live. Let us allow Bosnia the means to defend itself and, in defending itself, Bosnia will defend our most sincere ideals.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Afghanistan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KHARRAZI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. I am confident that your wisdom and vast diplomatic skills will effectively guide our deliberations on the tragic and deteriorating situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov of the Russian Federation for his able guidance of the Council last month.

The tragedy in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, marked by genocidal Serbian aggression against the Muslim population of that country, has escalated to extremely disturbing levels. Over the past few weeks, the Serbian aggressors have continuously intensified their acts of aggression against the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina through the abhorent policy of

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

"ethnic cleansing", the killing of defenceless people and the mass deportation of civilians. Even those cities which have been declared by the Council to be "safe areas" continue to be subjected to massive daily shelling by the Serbs.

Undoubtedly, this situation calls for urgent and resolute action on the part of the international community. However, the 39 resolutions and 33 statements adopted by the Security Council on the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina have failed to reverse the Serbian aggression and war crimes which have been so systematically perpetrated against the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

A review of the Security Council attitude towards this brutal uprooting and gradual extinction of a young Member of the United Nations reveals clearly that a passive approach and a policy characterized by double standards, appeasement and leniency towards the aggressor have prevented the international community from establishing justice. This has allowed the aggressor to dictate its terms to the Security Council and to continue its aggression with impunity. Therefore, not surprisingly, the Security Council has been unable to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations to halt the Serbian aggression, much less to reverse it. Indeed, had the Security Council acted decisively and expeditiously when the Serbs started their aggression, as it did in the course of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, we would not be facing the continuation of the insolent policy of "ethnic cleansing", its legitimisation and the alarming possibility of the dismemberment of a State Member of our Organization.

When resolution 836 (1993) on "safe areas" was adopted, the international community was assured by the sponsors of that resolution that a peace

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

settlement must be based on the principles contained in the peace plan of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia and that there can be no acceptance of the acquisition of territory or alteration of borders by force. However, these promises did not change the deteriorating situation on the ground and the Serbian aggressors have continued their atrocities unchecked. The establishment of "safe areas" which was first viewed to be not only a meagre palliative but also a first step towards defeating Serbian aggression and restoring the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina has now been interpreted by the Serbs as a euphemism for refugee camps and the capitulation of the Muslim people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

The Islamic Republic of Iran, together with an overwhelming majority of other Member States, has warned about and rejected any intention to use the "safe areas" in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as permanent refugee camps which would perpetuate the fruits of aggression, occupation and territorial gains.

The Security Council stands at a crucial stage of the assessment of its ability to maintain international peace and security. It has already had recourse to peripheral measures to tackle the Serbian aggression, but has refused to invoke the necessary and primary ones. It is evident that the Security Council has not provided collective security to protect the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina against Serbian assaults and atrocities. Moreover, it has backed an arms embargo that prevents the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina from acquiring weapons adequate for self-defence.

The proposals jointly put forward by the Croats and Serbs aim, in essence, largely to freeze the present status quo and seek to legitimize the territorial gains made by them through the use of force and the practice of "ethnic cleansing". It is high time for the Council to remedy its past mistakes. The Security Council must immediately, without further delay, take all necessary measures to stop the genocide and reverse the aggression. The Council has moral, political and legal obligations to respond in an effective manner to the will of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina - a sovereign Member State which is nearing extinction.

In this context, the Islamic Republic of Iran supports the draft resolution, which, among other things, recognizes the inherent right of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a State Member of the United Nations, to individual and

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

collective self-defence as stipulated in Article 51 of the Charter. It needs to be emphasized that the draft resolution once adopted will strengthen the many previous resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, including resolution 836 (1993).

The critical question is whether the Security Council should be guided by political expedience or by the human conscience, which is wounded and shocked by the heinous crimes of the Serbs. How will history judge the Security Council if it fails to proceed with plans aimed at ensuring the survival of a State Member of the United Nations and reversing the Serbian aggression? Undoubtedly, insufficient action by the Security Council at this crucial stage will call into serious doubt the authority of this organ for the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Security Council to act decisively, if it is not to be judged as an organ applying double standards in dealing with different issues.

In conclusion, I should like to request that the Islamic Republic of Iran be included in the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution, document S/25997.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SAMHAN (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the United Arab Emirates and the other countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar and the Sultanate

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

of Oman, I have pleasure at the outset, Sir, in extending our congratulations to you on your presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are fully confident that thanks to your wide diplomatic experience and your expertise and skill the Council's work will be successfully concluded. I also wish to take this opportunity to extend to your predecessor, the Ambassador of the Russian Federation, our appreciation of his presidency of the Council last month.

The Security Council is once again meeting to deal with the tragic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Council has discussed the matter before and adopted a number of resolutions and approved presidential statements on the issue. Previous speakers have unanimously agreed in diagnosing the current situation that it will have a grave impact on international peace and security as a result of the current military aggression, which is continuing, perpetrated by the Serbs, supported by the regular armed forces of Serbia and Montenegro, against the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly the Muslims there. The whole world has been shocked by the horrible tragedy; it is a real shock to the conscience of every person who is looking forward to a propitious international environment in which coexistence, peace and stability may prevail among the peoples of the world.

The latest events demonstrate that the Serbs will not voluntarily abandon their atrocious campaign of "ethnic cleansing", or their objective, which is the establishment of "Greater Serbia". They have taken advantage of peace initiatives and negotiations that are still going on as a cover for inhuman violations and practices and for aggressive expansionist policies, in withstanding any pressures from the international community.

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

In view of all that, the failure of the current diplomatic efforts and the absence of any evidence that the Serbs are thinking of putting an end to their brutal, criminal, aggressive policies, or even of implementing Security Council resolutions, we are more than ever convinced that there is no political or legal pretext to justify the continued arms embargo imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

At their latest summit meeting, held in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates, the leaders of the Gulf Cooperation Council stated:

> "The Council affirm their full support for Bosnia and Herzegovina in its painful ordeal and in its heroic defence of its territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, and requests the Security Council to lift the arms embargo imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina so that it may face up to the aggressor and exercise its legitimate right to self-defence, a matter which complies with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. They also call upon the international community to extend all possible forms of assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina based on the fact that deterring aggression is a collective international responsibility. They call upon the international community to take a unified firm stance in implementation of the Council's resolutions as well as resolutions of the London Conference."

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

We note also that at its forty-seventh session the General Assembly adopted resolution 47/121, which reaffirmed the right of Bosnia and Herzegovina to self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. That resolution reflects international legality and the collective will of the majority of States Members of the United Nations. It also, inter alia, states the need to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina to enable it to exercise its legitimate right to self-defence and to restore its sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. The Security Council should adopt a similar resolution upholding the principles of the Charter and international law.

The World Conference on Human Rights, held recently at Vienna, categorically condemned the continued aggression, "ethnic cleansing" and genocide perpetrated against Bosnia and Herzegovina. It called for the lifting of the arms embargo imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina so that it could exercise its right to self-defence. The Conference also called for a halt to arms supplies to Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It affirmed the need to restore the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Gulf Cooperation Council believes that the embargo imposed by the United Nations on the former Yugoslavia is clearly intended to apply to aggressors; it should not deprive the victims of aggression of their right to self-defence. Acquiescing in this serious situation and doing nothing to rectify it, at a time when the Serbs are receiving heavy weapons and other military supplies that enable them to tighten their grip on the territories

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

they have acquired by force, constitutes an acceptance of the policy of "ethnic cleansing" and aggression, which poses a threat to international peace and security and violates the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations. That is a grave situation which runs counter to international law and the Charter.

It is most important that there be an end to further bloodshed, rape and displacement, and to Serb military attacks against innocent civilians, particularly Muslims. It is vital that the sieges against villages and towns be lifted and that international efforts to protect the safe areas be strengthened, in conformity with Security Council resolutions.

The solutions for which we are calling are in accordance with the Charter and international law and would ensure respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and non-recognition of aggression and the acquisition of territory by force.

In our view, the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is a collective one in which the Security Council has a paramount role to play. We must not let a handful of people with religious, national or ethnic biases, supported by Serbia and Montenegro, continue their violations against the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina; that would be contrary to the fundamental principles of the Charter and all the norms governing international relations.

The Gulf Cooperation Council believes that the draft resolution before the Council is the minimum it can accept in the effort to solve the problem. Lifting the embargo would be aimed not only at letting Bosnia and Herzegovina

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

exercise its right to self-defence, but also at defending international legality as represented in the Charter and at enhancing the credibility of the United Nations and particularly the Security Council with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the United Arab Emirates for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Senegal - a country with excellent relations of friendship and cooperation with your country, Sir - is pleased to see you presiding over the work of the Council this month - a task you are carrying out with ability, selflessness and skill. As I warmly congratulate you, I want to reaffirm our total support as you endeavour to find good solutions to the important issues before the Council.

Our congratulations go also to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, for his remarkable work last month.

I want finally to thank all the members of the Council for this opportunity to participate in this important debate on the tragic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The aggression perpetrated by the Serbs against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the ensuing violations of international humanitarian law,

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

the most serious of which is "ethnic cleansing", has now attained proportions that yet again challenge our collective conscience. The daily deterioration of the situation in that country is all the more intolerable because it clearly stems from the systematic refusal by the Serbs to abide by the numerous Security Council resolutions on this matter.

The Serbs have met with contempt and arrogance the Vance-Owen Peace Plan, which was accepted and signed by two of the three parties involved and on which the international community had pinned great hopes. Yet I would recall that that Plan had always been put forward as the only and the best solution. Frequently, the Plan had even served as a pretext for discouraging the Bosnian authorities from requesting that the embargo imposed on the former Yugoslavia by resolution 713 (1991) be lifted in the case of their country to enable it under Article 51 of the Charter to engage in self-defence. The proponents of this thesis, once the Plan was signed and accepted, promised by all means available, including the use of force, to make the Serb side to go along with the Plan.

Hence, when it was announced that those two parties had accepted the Plan we hoped sincerely that Bosnia and Herzegovina and its people would finally regain peace and security. We anticipated determined action by the Security Council to impose its authority and put an end to this deplorable conflict. We were extremely disappointed when the Serb side, its actions having gone unpunished, simply continued its aggression, indulging in the luxury of proposing the replacement of the Vance-Owen Plan with a bald partition of Bosnia and Herzegovina into three republics delineated on ethnic lines.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

If the Security Council accepts that proposal, it will have enshrined the fait accompli desired by the aggressor, whose ultimate purpose is without doubt to wipe Bosnia and Herzegovina off the map against the sovereign will and deep-seated aspirations of its people, as freely expressed when it founded the Republic.

For its part, Senegal cannot endorse such an approach, especially since our Head of State, His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, current Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, has consistently drawn the attention of the international community to this risk and to the need to take the measures necessary to find a good and just solution to this question, one based on respect for law and on equity.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

This solution, and I repeat it formally here, must necessarily be based on an immediate cessation of hostilities; the withdrawal by the Serbs from the territories they have occupied by force; compensation for the consequences of "ethnic cleansing" and, specifically, the return of the refugees to their homes; and, lastly, the restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In our view, the Security Council has the duty and the responsibility to put an end to the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to ensure peace and security there. It has that duty, because, as a sage once put it, its principal mission is that of preventing this world, with its greed and its injustices, from resembling hell. The Council must cause peace and security to reign so that the Earth becomes a haven of perfect peace where there is no more greed, hate, ignorance, suffering or obscurantism. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, as indeed everywhere else that human lives are threatened, the Council must ensure that wisdom enlightens all minds and that the gentle rain of compassion waters all hearts to transform the blood that has been spilled into the milk of human kindness, and cruelty into respect for human dignity and the rule of law. This is the most ardent hope that we should have liked to see the Security Council fulfil in Bosnia and Herzegovina, without foot-dragging or hesitation, or any sign of acquiescence or culpable weakness.

What has been happening in that country for more than a year now has, however, caused us to have our doubts, as all the Security Council's resolutions, including resolutions 713 (1991), 757 (1992), 824 (1993) and 836 (1993), have been ignored and flouted by the aggressor. The lack of a sufficient and appropriate reaction to this attitude of scorn and defiance towards the international community has certainly compounded the tribulations of the people of that country.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

The Security Council's persistent wish to deny the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina its right to self-defence as authorized under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter is paradoxically rewarding the aggressor, who, despite the military embargo, has always had the benefit of weapons of every kind. The Security Council has, unfortunately, enabled the aggressor to expand and consolidate his territorial gains, in violation of the principles and ideals of the Charter of our Organization, which the Security Council is none the less obliged to uphold.

The Security Council's inability - or rather, its lack of political will - to impose a cease-fire on the forces of aggression in order to bring them to seek a negotiated solution is on the point of creating - and will create, if we are not careful - a precedent that is dangerous, particularly for a world in the throes of change where confrontation must give way to peaceful coexistence and the selfishness of States to genuine international solidarity. We also run the risk of opening the door to all sorts of dangerous ventures based on goals similar to those openly being pursued by the Serbs.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm that we would have preferred there to be a strict application of the Security Council's resolutions, but the fact remains that the Council has not yet given us any meaningful proof of its determination to act along such lines, even though it has already proved that it does have the means to do so.

Also, time is not on the side of the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the survival of its people. We therefore feel that urgent counter-measures must be taken, including lifting the military embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina which, all things considered, applies to that country alone.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

This step is in no way contradictory to pursuing the peace efforts because, in an armed conflict, one cannot prevent one party, let alone the victim of known aggression, acquiring the necessary means to ensure its self-defence while the other party continues to arm and to expand its territorial conquests with a view, even if it does not achieve its sinister design, of at least considerably strengthening its position in possible negotiations.

This is the real thrust of the draft resolution before the Council, which we support wholeheartedly and are sponsoring for the reasons I have mentioned, in the sincere hope that the Security Council will adopt it. By doing so, the Council would send a message of deterrence to the Serbian side, whereas if it does not, it would hand it another incentive to persist in its intransigence and in its contempt for the law and for the force of reason.

I am sure that, faced with this choice, the Council will take the right decision, or risk seriously damaging its credibility, which is more than ever threatened, and dashing the many hopes that have been rested on it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Senegal for his kind words addressed to me.

In accordance with the decision taken earlier in the meeting, I now invite Ambassador Dragomir Djokic to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. DJOKIC: The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia strongly opposes exempting one side involved in the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the arms embargo imposed by Security Council resolution 713 (1991). Such a proposal, as an example of political myopia, is not only unacceptable but is fraught with danger and would result in the continuation and further escalation of the civil, inter-ethnic and religious war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Should the proposed draft resolution be adopted, the Security Council would, under the false pretext of protecting the exercise of the inherent right of self-defence, merely contravene its past efforts to contain the crisis and find a lasting political solution. As a result, Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is already replete with arms, would be engulfed with even more weapons and destruction, resulting in further killings, atrocities and suffering by the innocent.

Lifting the arms embargo and supplying arms to one side would invariably lead to an arms race between the warring parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with unforeseeable consequences. It would be erroneous to assume that arming the Muslim forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina would lead to peace: on the contrary, it would surely represent a serious setback to a political settlement. Those sponsoring the draft resolution are evidently not committed to a peaceful resolution of the conflict, but are instead trying to achieve their own limited political objectives. It is particularly disturbing and sad that this initiative has come at a moment when the peace process, after a long stalemate, is showing signs of progress towards a settlement based on the vital interests of all three sides.

(Mr. Djokic)

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is rendering its full contribution to a peaceful and just resolution of the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Despite the unfair and inhumane sanctions that have unjustly been imposed against my country, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which is not a party to the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, will spare no effort to help prevent further bloodshed between the three constituent nations and to find a solution based on their legitimate interests and rights.

(Mr. Djokic)

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia accords absolute priority to the immediate and unconditional cessation of hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is our firm conviction that there is no alternative to an overall political settlement and that the international community and the United Nations, including the Security Council, should do everything in their power to facilitate a negotiated settlement and encourage the Bosnian parties to reach one.

At a time when intensive and constructive negotiations are under way in Geneva, the adoption of this draft resolution, regardless of its motives, would take us farther from that goal.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is committed to helping the Bosnian parties find the road to a just peace on the basis of equal respect for the legitimate rights of all three constitutent peoples.

The proposed draft resolution is one of war rather than peace. We would therefore hope that the Security Council, which under the Charter bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, will be guided by the noble principles enshrined in it and will not adopt the proposed draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Ukraine, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Khandogy (Ukraine) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. HADID (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Allow me first of all to express to you, Sir, the satisfaction of the Algerian delegation on seeing you presiding over the Council this month with your well-known effectiveness and ability. I must also pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Vorontsov of the Russian Federation, for his outstanding stewardship of the Council during the month of May.

I must also say that I fully agree with the statements of the representatives of Indonesia and Jordan, speaking here in the capacity of President of the Non-Aligned Movement and on behalf of the Arab Group in the United Nations, respectively.

Once again the Security Council finds itself face to face with its responsibilities relating to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, now more tragic than ever.

After more than a year of effort, discussion and negotiation, punctuated by more than three dozen resolutions and just as many statements, the balance sheet of international action gives little cause for satisfaction and offers little hope for the future.

Half-measures, procrastination and divisions within the international community in the face of this situation of blatant aggression provide no justice for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a State Member of the United Nations. Nor do they respond to the essential need for stability in

(Mr. Hadid, Algeria)

the Balkan region, over which still hovers the risk of a major conflagration with incalculable casualties.

Even more serious, the Security Council is apparently being asked to acquiesce in a process, now openly under way, of carving up the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, thus departing from a cardinal principle of international relations that has been reaffirmed so many times here: the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force.

Moreover, the unspeakable practice of "ethnic cleansing" and the atrocities suffered by the Muslim population continue, assuming the proportions of genocide, as even the International Court of Justice has declared.

The provision of humanitarian aid is still being systematically and deliberately impeded. United Nations personnel themselves, who constitute the peace-keeping force, are subjected to constant attacks, despite the repeated warnings of the Council.

Algeria feels that it must reiterate its support for and solidarity with the Bosnian Government in the defence of its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence as a State Member of the United Nations. We stress that it is incumbent on the international community, primarily the Security Council, to ensure respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, sparing no effort to end aggression and restore justice and the rule of law.

Algeria fully supports the clear positions of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the initiatives of the non-aligned countries, which expect the Security Council to defend law and justice wherever they are threatened and to abandon the policy of the double standard.

(Mr. Hadid, Algeria)

We are firmly convinced that the time has come for the international community - and, in particular, for this Council - to condemn in no uncertain terms the aggressor and give the victims the means to exercise their natural right to self-defence, as enshrined in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The Bosnian Muslims, who with courage and dignity are facing up to untold barbarism, are entitled to demand here and now that they be given the means to ensure their self-defence.

We believe that logic, equity and the most basic justice call for an end to the anachronistic denial to the victim of the indispensable means for survival and the deterrence of aggression. The tragic circumstances of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the peace process, which has now begun to unravel, make it essential and urgent that, for the benefit of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the arms embargo imposed by resolution 713 (1993) be lifted. It must be recalled that the embargo was imposed in circumstances that were fundamentally different from those prevailing today, circumstances that defy the world's conscience.

For these reasons Algeria has co-sponsored the draft resolution before the Security Council, which was drafted by the non-aligned countries members of the Council.

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina indisputably involves the question of the Security Council's credibility. The imperatives of justice and the expectations of the international community and world-wide public opinion, which follow with indignation the sorrowful events that become more intense in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina with every passing day, call for bold measures to be taken to respond to the demands of this crisis whose nature is now quite clear to all.

(Mr. Hadid, Algeria)

Lifting the arms embargo for the benefit of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, controlling heavy arms, ending aggression, respecting human rights, reaffirming and respecting the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force and preserving the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina - these are the main requirements for a just solution in keeping with international law.

(Mr. Hadid, Algeria)

No intellectual exercise, however sophisticated, could justify failure to act. Humanitarian missions are of course necessary, but in themselves they are not enough to remove the responsibility from the Security Council of ensuring, as it is supposed to do under the Charter of the United Nations, the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Security Council, short of denying its mandate and relinquishing its mission, cannot confine itself to the role of an accessory to humanitarian organizations. As we see it, the opposite is what should be happening.

Not so long ago, the end of the cold war was welcomed as heralding the advent of a new era full of promise for mankind. Is it conceivable, is it moral, is it unavoidable, that this new era should in the final analysis turn out to be the era of genocide that is tolerated, expansionism that is accepted, and victims that are simply abandoned? Whether it be powerlessness or the use of a double standard, or both, the Security Council's responsibility vis-à-vis history is indeed engaged. Continuing indecision would not only give recognition to an unacceptable injustice, but also endanger international peace and security. In the final analysis, this would mean going against the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Algeria for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahariya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)(interpretation from Arabic): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your presidency of the Security Council during this month. I wish also to commend your predecessor, the

(Mr. Omar, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Ambassador of the Russian Federation, for his efforts during his presidency of the Council last month.

Before I make my statement, I wish to express support for the statement made by the Ambassador of Jordan on behalf of the Arab Group and that made by the Ambassador of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. I should like also to commend the non-aligned caucus in the Security Council for its tireless efforts with regard to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We noted with appreciation the letter (S/25782) dated 14 May 1993 addressed to the President of the Security Council. This letter reflects the views and concerns of the non-aligned caucus regarding the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The call by the caucus for the holding of this meeting and its initiative in submitting a draft resolution is a further element in these sincere efforts.

The draft resolution in document S/25997, submitted by the non-aligned caucus, is the result of the painful frustration and disappointment felt at the inability to put an end to the tragedy of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina; it has emerged from the feeling that everyone has abandoned that people's just cause.

This draft resolution is submitted in the framework of a situation of hesitation and of the failure of various projects, plans and resolutions to stop the continuing deterioration of the political and humanitarian situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is submitted also in the context of the strong doubts that have been expressed about the possibility of reaching a just settlement that would preserve the life and dignity of that people and a State that we all welcomed to the United Nations.

(Mr. Omar, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

This draft resolution does not contain any extraneous elements. It does not contradict the Charter of the United Nations. It reaffirms the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It calls for the immediate cessation of acts of aggression against the territory of that State and for the removal of the consequences of such aggression.

If our intentions are good, we cannot but agree with all that. We welcomed the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a Member of the United Nations. Does that Member not deserve our confirmation of its sovereignty? Does it not deserve our recognition of its territorial integrity, its political independence, its right to peace and security?

The draft resolution also calls for making available to that people all the means necessary for defending itself - a natural right enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and recognized by all norms of law and religion.

The draft resolution calls for exempting the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the arms embargo imposed on it by resolution 713 (1991), to enable it to defend itself. That is called for only to rectify a wrong done to a defenceless people, making it the target of aggression by the use of all kinds of weapons. The present situation of this people is like that of a person who has been thrown into the water with his hands tied and then told to be sure not to get wet. Resolution 713 (1991) deprived this people of its right to self-defence.

We do not believe that lifting the arms embargo against the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will escalate the violence of the

(Mr. Omar, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

situation, as some contend. This is a very strange argument made while the massacres continue every day.

The lifting of the arms embargo and the adoption of military measures to remove materiel are still options in the present circumstances to deal with the crisis and provide a climate favourable to the adoption of the peace plan. That is stated in the letter from the non-aligned States to the Security Council dated 14 May 1993.

(Mr. Omar, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

If the right of self-defence in this situation cannot be exercised, the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be a victim of the total disregard of international law and the resolutions of the Security Council. That people should be the first to be able to act under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. It should be given priority. It should be listened to. It should be supported and assisted in the exercise of its right of self-defence against massacres, "ethnic cleansing", the systematic rape of its women, the displacement of its children, the destruction of its places of worship and its homes, and the transformation of the rest of its territory into one great prison in which prisoners and refugees suffer from hunger and exposure.

This may be the last opportunity for the Security Council to regain the initiative, to adopt whatever measures are necessary to preserve the integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and to enable it to establish and maintain peace and security in that region while protecting its people in all its religious and ethnic diversity. In this regard, I should like to recall that, pursuant to Article 24 of the Charter, in carrying out its duties the Security Council acts on behalf of the Members of the United Nations. This means that the Security Council's actions should reflect the views of the international community, not those of certain Powers. When the Security Council fulfils its responsibilities, it should be fully aware of the principles and objectives of the United Nations and pay the utmost deference to legitimacy. It should not give in to certain interests and trends. If the Security Council acts appropriately, it will be embarking upon the path towards the establishment of a new international order and be distancing itself from its policy of double standards.

(Mr. Omar, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

If the Security Council is to be more than a debating society for adopting ineffectual measures and accepting faits accomplis, it must take the initiative. The issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a very important test, an opportunity not to be wasted. We hope that the draft resolution before us today will be adopted as a first step in a comprehensive plan to achieve a just solution to this issue.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KABIR (Bangladesh): Please allow me at the outset to join previous speakers in extending to you, Sir, my delegation's heartiest congratulations on your assumption of the office of the President of the Council for the month of June. We are confident that, under your wise leadership, the deliberations of the Council will lead to conclusions that are decisive and address the core of the issue.

I also take this opportunity to convey our profound appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Vorontsov of the Russian Federation, for his excellent skills in guiding the work of the Council last month.

Even as we debate the issue today, the agonized cry of the helpless people of Bosnia and Herzegovina continues unabated, touching the souls of all witnessing this incredible saga of pain. Needless to say, we have deliberated on this tragic issue many a time before, both in the Assembly and the Council, and adopted as many resolutions - but unfortunately to no avail. Nothing seems to deter Serbia in its planned pogrom against the Bosnian people, with

(Mr. Kabir, Bangladesh)

Muslims in Bosnia as a special target, or quench its insatiable desire to acquire Bosnian land and property and in the process cause senseless suffering to millions of innocent men, women and children across its territory. It seems our resolve or determination were not firm enough to draw the curtain on this heart-rending tragedy. It does not reflect a becoming picture of us Members of the United Nations as we watch helplessly the slow death in excruciating pain of a fellow Member.

We have time and again considered the consequences arising out of the lifting of the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina, though to many of us it was clear that Serbia's repugnant policy of "ethnic cleansing" was aimed at the liquidation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a nation. To some, however, a flame of hope still burned for an end to the human carnage and culmination in a peaceful solution.

We have now reached a stage where it is obvious to all that Serbia's intention is wantonly to persist in its policy of territorial acquisition until the conquest - "conquest", a word we though was left behind - of Bosnia and Herzegovina is completed. It was already felt by the World Conference on Human Rights held recently in Vienna, which decided to appeal to the Council to take the necessary measures to end what it termed "genocide" in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Conference therefore declared that now is the time for the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide to be implemented to the letter. At the same Conference, our Foreign Minister declared that:

> "Such violations go on because we apply different standards to different situations. In our opinion, if human rights values are to become universal and self-sustaining, such a dual attitude or selectivity on our part must go".

(Mr. Kabir, Bangladesh)

Let us not fail here to see what we had already observed and accepted in Vienna. Let us make all-out efforts to save a fellow Member nation from total extinction. Let us decide now to adopt immediate measures to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina to enable the Government and people to exercise their inherent right of self-defence. All of our earlier resolutions were contemptuously ignored by the Serbians in their march towards expansionism and "ethnic cleansing". Our earlier resolution 713 (1991) on the arms embargo against the former Yugoslavia was meant to deter the aggressor. We now see it has failed to do so. While the Serbians continued to be swamped by arms and ammunition, the effect of the embargo was disastrous to and bitterly felt by the Bosnians alone. They became helpless targets of elimination while we and the world sat and watched as they slowly became prisoners in their own land in so-called "safe areas". Therefore, if we do not, even now, lift the arms embargo to enable them to fight for their survival, we shall see sadly before our eyes the demise of the Bosnians as a people and the end of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a sovereign nation.